



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/520,609	08/31/2005	Emmanuel Marot	GRY-133US	9652
23122	7590	05/22/2009	EXAMINER	
RATNERPRESTIA			YU, XIANG	
P.O. BOX 980			ART UNIT	
VALLEY FORGE, PA 19482			PAPER NUMBER	
			2445	
			MAIL DATE	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			05/22/2009	
			PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/520,609

Applicant(s)

MAROT ET AL.

Examiner

Xiang Yu

Art Unit

2445

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 January 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SG/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Remarks/Arguments

1. This is a non-final Office Action in response to the present US application number 10/520,609 filed on January 23rd, 2009, where claims 1-26 are pending and have been examined.

Previous claim objections to claims 6, 11, and 19 have been withdrawn in view of the newly amended claims.

In view of substantial changes to independent claims 1, 14 and 22 along with several of the dependent claims, new art has been applied. Applicant's arguments are now moot. Please see the new claim rejections for further clarifications.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. **Claims 1-4, 7-9, 13-16, 19, 21, 22, 24, and 26** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. US 2003/0055870 A1 to *Smethers, Paul A.* ("*Smethers*").

As to **claim 1**, *Smethers* discloses **method for communication between a terminal and a server of a communication network, the server or data of the server being identified by an address, the method comprising:**

in response to a user input, and based on first parameters, displaying codes stored in a code base of the terminal to enable the user to select among the displayed codes. In particular, *Smethers* further discloses the concept within one of the various embodiments wherein a user can input into their client device (or terminal) a compact bookmark identifier, that links to a stored bookmark (e.g. *Smethers*: paragraphs [0052] and [0071-0072]). The interface of the client device consists of a display screen, a phone keypad, and some other generic buttons for navigation and such (e.g. *Smethers*: paragraphs [0046-0047] and Figures 5-7). In addition, these identifier codes would be small in size (i.e. "&1" would be just two bytes) and can easily be stored within the client (or terminal) device (e.g. *Smethers*: paragraph [0072]);

transmitting a user-selected code to a routing server configured to identify, based on second parameters, other codes associated with the user-selected code and stored in a base of the routing server. In particular, *Smethers* further discloses the concept within one of the various embodiments wherein the compact identifier (selected by the user) are sent from the client device and received by a proxy server, which can convert the compact bookmark identifiers to a normal request (or second parameter) (i.e. normal requests are

associated with the appropriate URL of the bookmark) (e.g. *Smethers*: paragraph [0052] and Figures 6 and 7);

receiving the identified codes associated with the user-selected code from the routing server, wherein the identified codes are different from and do not include the user-selected code. In particular, *Smethers* further discloses the concept within one of the various embodiments wherein the client device receives the response (or identified URL address(es)) and is different from the initially sent compact bookmark identifier (e.g. *Smethers*: paragraph [0077]);

displaying the identified codes at the terminal to enable the user to select among the identified codes. In particular, *Smethers* further discloses the concept within one of the various embodiments wherein a user can choose from a list of available bookmarks (or identified codes) (e.g. *Smethers*: paragraph [0060]);

transmitting a user-selected identified code to the routing server. In particular, *Smethers* further discloses the concept within one of the various embodiments wherein once the bookmark has been selected, the associated URL is retrieved from the routing server, where it's stored or redirected through the routing server to wherever it's stored (e.g. *Smethers*: paragraphs [0052], [0056] and [0060]);

receiving from the routing server an address associated with the user-selected identified code. In particular, *Smethers* further discloses the

concept within one of the various embodiments wherein the proxy server can return to the client device the associated URL address to the selected bookmark, or redirect the client to the appropriate location where the requested information resides (e.g. *Smethers*: paragraphs [0052] and [0056]); and

automatically accessing the address. In particular, *Smethers* further discloses the concept within one of the various embodiments wherein once the selected bookmark is identified, the associated URL is accessed and the results are transmitted back to the client device (e.g. *Smethers*: paragraph [0056]).

As to **claim 2**, *Smethers* further discloses **a method in accordance with claim 1, comprising the step of changing the code base of the terminal or changing an address of the routing server stored by the terminal for transmitting a code to the routing server by transmitting a command from the routing server** (modifying the bookmarks and the associated bookmark identifiers, e.g. *Smethers*: paragraphs [0057-0058]).

As to **claim 3**, *Smethers* further discloses **a method in accordance with claim 2, comprising changing the code base of the terminal by executing at least one of the following operations: the storage of a new code, the elimination of a code, the creation, changing or deletion of a code group or dictionary, or the allocation of a display priority among the codes** (creating,

modifying, and deleting bookmarks and their associated keystrokes, e.g. paragraphs [0057-0058]).

As to **claim 4**, *Smethers* further discloses **a method in accordance with claim 2 or 3, comprising transmitting a change command from the server to the terminal when the server communicates an address to the terminal** (the response to the requested bookmark would be returned to the client end with the associated URL destination from the proxy server, e.g. *Smethers*: paragraphs [0079]).

As to **claim 7**, *Smethers* further discloses **a method in accordance with claims 1, 2 or 3, comprising in the routing server, identifying the other codes associated with the user-selected code based on the user-selected code and based on second parameters, and transmitting the identified codes to the terminal** (the proxy server can interpret and identify the user's compact bookmark identifier and convert it to a normal request with an associated URL, e.g. *Smethers*: paragraph [0052]).

As to **claim 8**, *Smethers* further discloses **a method in accordance with claims 1, 2 or 3, comprising considering the user input to be a code that is transmitted to the routing server** (two bytes for each of the compact bookmark identifier, e.g. *Smethers*: paragraph [0072]).

As to **claim 9**, *Smethers* further discloses a method in accordance with **claims 1, 2 or 3, comprising grouping the codes of the terminal into dictionaries, each dictionary being characteristic of a category of codes** (interface card decks can display lists of possible bookmark choices, which would consist of various categories, e.g. *Smethers*: paragraph [0060]).

As to **claim 13**, *Smethers* further discloses a method in accordance with **claims 1, 2 or 3, wherein an intermediate server comprising an address base provided by the base of the routing server is used for receiving the user-selected code sent by the terminal, for transmitting an address or codes to the terminal, for transmitting the code received to the routing server, or for transmitting commands changing the code base of the terminal** (the proxy server device performs the functions of translating the compact identifiers into normal codes with associated URLs and either sends those back to the client or redirects them further to an information server where the requested information resides, e.g. *Smethers*: paragraphs [0052] and [0056]).

As to **claim 14**, see the similar conceptual rejection of claim 1.

As to **claims 15, 16, and 19**, see the corresponding conceptual rejections of claims 2, 3, and 9 respectively.

As to **claim 21**, *Smethers* further discloses **a terminal in accordance with claim 20, the terminal being configured to select and display the codes as the input based on a similarity between the first elements of the input and the first elements of the codes of the base** ("Acme" on the client end terminal or device corresponding to "Acme Corporation-Home Page" on the server end, e.g. *Smethers*: paragraph [0065]).

As to **claim 22**, see the corresponding rejections of claims 1 and 2.

As to **claim 24**, see the similar corresponding rejection of claims 9.

As to **claim 26**, *Smethers* further discloses **a server in accordance with one of the claims 22 through 25, the server being configured to transmit a server or data address to the terminal, and command the terminal to store a dictionary, on the basis of the server or data address transmitted** (interface card decks can display lists of possible bookmark choices, which would consist of various categories, e.g. *Smethers*: paragraph [0060]).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 5, 6, 10-12, 17, 18, 20, 23, and 25** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. US 2003/0055870 A1 to *Smethers* in view of International Publication WO 01/82556 A2 to Popp, Nicolas ("Popp").

As to **claim 5**, *Smethers* does not expressly further disclose of a **method in accordance with claims 1, 2 or 3, comprising considering a similarity between the user input and a stored code to be one of the first parameters, such that the codes that are displayed are the codes most similar to the input; and wherein the base of the routing server contains more codes than the code base of the terminal** (a greater number of bookmarks are supported and stored within the proxy server device or another remote server, over the client device, e.g. *Smethers*: paragraph [0050]).

Popp more expressly discloses the concept of wherein a user's inputs can cause the server to return a list of possible results that are most similar to the inputted query (e.g. *Popp*: page 5, lines 29 – page 6, lines 12).

Smethers and *Popp* are analogous art because they are in the same field of endeavor with respect to having a client request for information from or through a server.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine *Popp's* concept of getting a list of similar results to the user's input within *Smethers'* concept of requesting a desired bookmark URL from an information server or proxy server through a client device or terminal. The suggestion/motivation for combining them would be in case if the user accidentally entered the wrong keystrokes, the server would still return a list of results that are most similar or relevant to the user's requests, and thus improving the efficiency of the overall system (e.g. *Smethers*: paragraph [0013]).

As to **claim 6**, *Smethers* does not expressly further disclose of a **method in accordance with claim 5, comprising allocating a cost for each correction of an element of the user input, to obtain an element of the code to determine similarity between the user input and a code, wherein a lower sum of the costs for obtaining a code by correcting the user input, corresponds to a higher similarity between the user input and one of the codes, and wherein the association between the identified codes and the user-selected code is based on glossary or subject criteria.**

Popp more expressly discloses the concept of wherein each of the URI's (or codes) are ranked with some scale of popularity (or similarity). Furthermore, the navigation server would also respond to user requests with the URI that corresponds the most (e.g. *Popp*: page 10, lines 23-33 and Figure 5). Providing the most relevant and similar results to a user would reduce the overall amount

of exchanges between client and server systems and in effect lower bandwidth and costs. Thus, there is a direct relationship between the similarity of user input requests and the stored server codes with the cost value of correcting or changing any elements.

Popp and *Smethers* are analogous art because they are in the same field of endeavor with respect to having a client request for information from or through a server.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art to combine *Popp*'s concept of cost considerations within *Smethers*' concept of requesting a desired bookmark URL from an information server or proxy server through a client device or terminal. The suggestion/motivation for combining them is already seen through *Smethers*' concept of using compact identifiers that are only two bytes in size, and thus greatly reducing costs if changes were needed (e.g. *Smethers*: paragraphs [0013] and [0072]).

As to **claim 10**, *Smethers* does not expressly further disclose of a **method in accordance with claim 9, comprising considering a context of the user input to be a first selection parameter, setting a selection priority among the codes coming from different dictionaries, the context being related to at least one parameter selected from a group consisting of: data displayed by the terminal, an access in progress, a communication in progress, a geographic location of the terminal, a telephone operator transmitting the**

communications, a network access provider, a history of accesses made by the terminal, sites indicated as favorites, a type of the terminal, and an operating language of the terminal.

Popp more expressly discloses the concepts of query context vectors that consists of various parameters including, keyword, language, category, geography, etc. These parameters are measured for relevance and be used as a selection priority among lists of codes or identifiers from the various category dictionaries (e.g. *Popp*: page 8, lines 10 – page 9, lines 29).

Popp and *Smethers* are analogous art because they are in the same field of endeavor with respect to having a client request for information from or through a server.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art to combine *Popp*'s concept of having selection priority within *Smethers*' concept of client users requesting for particular bookmarks and their associated URLs. The suggestion/motivation for combining them would be to create an efficient system and prioritize requests if needed (e.g. *Smethers*: paragraph [0013]).

As to **claim 11**, *Smethers* does not expressly further disclose of **a method in accordance with claim 10, comprising transmitting the at least one parameter to the routing server during the transmission of a code.**

Popp more expressly discloses the concepts of transmitting along the query context vector, which can be n-dimensional with n number of elements, and each of which is a parameter of the query (e.g. *Popp*: page 8, lines 10 – page 9, lines 29).

Popp and *Smethers* are analogous art because they are in the same field of endeavor with respect to having a client request for information from or through a server.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art to combine *Popp*'s concept of transmitting parameters along with a requested identifier within *Smethers*' concept of requesting a desired bookmark URL from an information server or proxy server through a client device or terminal. The suggestion/motivation for combining them would be to possibly provide greater details with each requested bookmark, thus making the search more efficient in finding the target (e.g. *Smethers*: paragraph [0013]).

As to **claim 12**, *Smethers* does not expressly further disclose of **a method in accordance with claim 11, wherein addresses or codes associated with addresses are grouped by dictionaries characteristic of an address category, a parameter of the context of the input or an identifier of the user is used as one of the second selection parameters allocating a priority to an address coming from a first dictionary vis-a-vis an address coming from**

a second dictionary or to a code coming from the first dictionary vis-a-vis a code coming from the second dictionary.

Popp more expressly discloses the concepts of wherein the navigation server can reorder the list of resource records based on the relevance ranking criteria using the weighted query context vector (e.g. *Popp*: page 8, lines 10 – page 9, lines 29).

Popp and *Smethers* are analogous art because they are in the same field of endeavor with respect to having a client request for information from or through a server.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art to combine *Popp*'s concept of ranking priorities within *Smethers*' concept of requesting a desired bookmark URL from an information server or proxy server through a client device or terminal. The suggestion/motivation for combining them would be to make the search more efficient through ranking the results (e.g. *Smethers*: paragraph [0013]).

As to **claims 17, 18, and 20**, see the corresponding conceptual rejections of claims 5, 6, and 10 respectively.

As to **claims 23 and 25**, see the similar corresponding rejection of claims 5 and 10 respectively.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to XIANG YU whose telephone number is (571)270-5695. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:00am - 5:00pm with every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrice L. Winder can be reached on (571)272-3935. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Patrice Winder/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2445

/X. Y./
Examiner, Art Unit 2445